

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-23 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 21, and 23 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, and 11-20 are amended, and claims 21-23 are being added. The amendments to the specification update identifying information for related applications and correct typographical errors. No new matter is entered.

Based on the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Action on pages 2-3, claims 1-8, 10-13, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,571,724 to Johnson (hereinafter "Johnson"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Johnson fails to teach any of the elements of claim 1. Specifically, as amended, claim 1 recites a method for end to end environmental data acquisition and delivery comprising the steps of: ***acquiring a first set of environmental subsurface data*** in a first location via ***direct reading sensors***; ***geo-referencing*** said data; ***transmitting*** said data ***to a data analysis application server***; ***analyzing said data to obtain information about said data***; and ***using said information to select a next location***.

First, Johnson fails to teach acquiring environmental **subsurface** data. Instead, Johnson teaches determining an amount and concentration of **smog** in **air**. Johnson makes no reference to acquiring data from beneath the earth's surface. Therefore, Johnson fails to teach acquiring environmental subsurface data.

Second, Johnson fails to teach acquiring data via **direct reading sensors**. Instead, Johnson describes sampling, measuring chemical reactions when NO is injected into the air, and modeling chemical reactions. (See Johnson, col. 5, line 45 to col. 6, line 15). In contrast, the direct reading sensors of claim 1 may include, e.g., direct sensing technologies; optical sensors; chemical sensors; electromechanical sensors; membrane interface probe (MIP) sensors; advanced MIP sensors; laser induced fluorescence (LIF) sensors; ultraviolet induced fluorescence (UVF) sensors; polymer

sensors; or haloprobe sensors. (See para. 0020). Therefore, Johnson fails to teach acquiring data via direct reading sensors.

Third, Johnson fails to teach geo-referencing data. Instead, Johnson only discusses generally locating a source of a chemical or smog in the air, without discussing a frame of reference or a coordinate system. (see, e.g., Johnson, col. 20, lines 65-67). There is no discussion of geo-referencing data. Therefore, Johnson fails to teach geo-referencing data.

Fourth, Johnson fails to teach transmitting data to a data analysis application server. The Action aligns the interactions of computer 122 and temperature sensor 123 of Johnson with transmission to a data analysis application server. This alignment is not correct. Computer 122 of Johnson performs a variety of calculations (see Johnson, col. 37 line 42 to col. 38, line 62), but is not a data analysis application server as described, for example, in paragraphs 0147-0148 of the present specification. Therefore, Johnson fails to teach transmitting data to a data analysis application server.

Fifth, Johnson fails to teach analyzing environmental subsurface data to obtain information about the data. Instead, Johnson discusses measuring and modeling the chemical formation of smog in air. (See Johnson, col. 5 line 45 to col. 6 line 13). The method embodiments of Johnson describe "measuring" chemical mixtures and "determining" coefficients or concentrations. (See Johnson, col. 8, line 48 to col. 12 line 54). In contrast, the analyzing step of claim 1 may include, for example, "analyz[ing] and account[ing] for variations in pressure, flow rate, condition of detectors (can account for drift and can calibrate, e.g., using a tracer gas), depth of the probe (hydrostatic), and in the baseline noise due to the analytical/electrical system." (See para. 0094). Therefore, Johnson fails to teach analyzing environmental subsurface data to obtain information about the data.

Sixth, Johnson fails to teach using said information to select a next location. There is no discussion in Johnson about using information from analyzed data to select a next location for acquiring data. In contrast, the method in claim 1 uses the information obtained from the analysis of the environmental subsurface data from a first data set to determine where a subsequent data set should be acquired. See, e.g., the specification at paragraphs 0115-0116. Therefore, Johnson fails to teach using said information to select a next location.

Therefore, Johnson fails to teach the elements of claim 1, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and claim 1 allowed.

Further, claims 2-8, 10-13, 18 and 20 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as being dependent on an allowable claim. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Action on pages 3-4, claims 9, 14-17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,205 to Salvo (hereinafter "Salvo"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 9, 14-17, and 19 depend from claim 1, and are allowable as being dependent on an allowable claim, as discussed above. Further, the combination of Johnson and Salvo fails to overcome the deficiencies of Johnson.

Salvo does not teach **geo-referencing data**. Instead, Salvo teaches locating a fixed monitoring well with a GPS locator. The data obtained by a fixed sensor in the well is not specifically geo-referenced, especially in an altitude position.

Second, Salvo does not teach **using said information to select a next location**. Salvo does not discuss specifically how well sites are chosen, although Salvo suggests that wells are positioned at sites needing remediation, or near drinking water wells. Salvo does not use information from data collected at a well to determine the placement of another well.


Therefore, because Salvo and Johnson, alone or in combination, fail to teach at least two elements of claim 1, claims 9, 14-17 and 19 are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: January 13, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ralph P. Albrecht

Registration No.: 43,466

VENABLE LLP

P.O. Box 34385

Washington, DC 20043-9998

(202) 344-4000

(202) 344-8300 (Fax)

Attorney/Agent For Applicant